

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/779,016	.02	2/07/2001	Dan Vassilovski	010125	010125 5626	
23696	7590	12/03/2003		EXAMINER		
Qualcomm		ted	LEVITAN, DMITRY			
Patents Depa 5775 Moreho			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Diego, CA 92121-1714			2662			
				DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003	11	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>			
<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	α
Advisory Action	09/779,016	VASSILOVSKI ET AL	' //
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dmitry Levitan	2662	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	9SS
THE REPLY FILED 06 November 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi eal (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper replication in the case of the case o	y to a ation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Se	e MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the distance of the dist	e fee. The appropriate exter the final Office action; or (2	nsion fee under 2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) M they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
$3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	nt(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b would be rejected is provided bel)⊠ will be entered a ow or appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed: 1-6			
Claim(s) objected to: 8-11.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7 and 1</u> 2			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	1	
10. Other:	HASSAN M SUPERVISORY PATS	1200	

Application No.



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's arguments filed 11/06/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner believes that claim 7 as amended, raises new issues that require new search.